



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,276	10/31/2003	Karen J. Smiley	ABDT-0578/B030100	1636
23377	7590	01/28/2005	EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP ONE LIBERTY PLACE, 46TH FLOOR 1650 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			TSAI, CAROL S W	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2857

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/698,276	SMILEY ET AL. <i>(CW)</i>	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Carol S Tsai	2857	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,13-17 and 29-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 2-12 and 18-28 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/01/2004.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 13, 17, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 5,629,870 to Farag et al.

With respect to claims 1 and 17, Farag et al. disclose a method for transformer testing, comprising: receiving a failing test result of a transformer, the test result being determined from a test taken during transformer manufacture (see col. 7, lines 31-57); determining, via a knowledge-based system, a predicted root cause of the failure based on the test result and a knowledge base of transformer information (see col. 12, line 5 to col. 13, line 8); and determining, via the knowledge-based system, a suggested course of action for the failure based on the test result and the knowledge base of transformer information (see col. 4, lines 29-32; col. 5, lines 11-29; col. 5, line 48 to col. 6, line 5; and col. 13, line 37 to col. 15, line 33).

As to claims 13 and 29, Farag et al. also disclose a prediction that a piece of transformer manufacturing equipment is out of calibration (see col. 10, lines 47-59).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 14-16 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farag et al. in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,369,582 to Coffeen.

As noted above, with respect to claims 14 and 30, Farag et al. disclose the claimed invention, except for modifying a scheduled transformer manufacturing step to compensate for the test failure.

Coffeen teaches modifying a scheduled transformer modifying a scheduled transformer manufacturing step to compensate for the test failure manufacturing step to compensate for the test failure (see col. 4, line 63 to col. 5, line 6).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farag et al.'s method to include modifying a scheduled transformer manufacturing step to compensate for the test failure, as taught by Coffeen, in order that a maintenance can be scheduled for the transformer.

As to claims 15 and 31, Farag et al. do not disclose redoing a previously completed transformer manufacturing step.

Coffeen teaches redoing a previously completed transformer manufacturing step (see col. 16, lines 21-26).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farag et al.'s method to include redoing a previously

completed transformer manufacturing step, as taught by Coffeen, in order that a suitable output pulse or signal can be detected (see Coffeen, col. 16, lines 25-26).

As to claims 16 and 32, Farag et al. do not disclose recalibrating a piece of transformer manufacturing equipment and redoing a previously completed transformer manufacturing step.

Coffeen teaches recalibrating a piece of transformer manufacturing equipment (see col. 4, line 63 to col. 5, line 6).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farag et al.'s method to include recalibrating a piece of transformer manufacturing equipment, as taught by Coffeen, in order that a maintenance can be scheduled for the transformer.

Coffeen teaches redoing a previously completed transformer manufacturing step (see col. 16, lines 21-26).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farag et al.'s method to include redoing a previously completed transformer manufacturing step, as taught by Coffeen, in order that a suitable output pulse or signal can be detected (see Coffeen, col. 16, lines 25-26).

#### *Allowable Subject Matter*

5. Claims 2-12 and 18-28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Schwartz discloses a system for diagnosing disorders of geographically distributed objects from a remote location.

Hamdan discloses a system and method for creating, editing, and/or executing a test program for testing a transformer.

Cuddihy discloses an exemplary embodiment of the invention relates to a method, system, and storage medium for building and maintaining a remote monitoring and diagnostics knowledge base via an alert fusion system.

Spira et al. disclose a method for doing business including a menu of services from which services are selected and performing those services on an outsourced basis to plants, such as industrial plants.

Spears discloses a method by which operating mechanical components of an electrical power distribution system may be evaluated to determine whether or not they exhibit operational characteristics which indicate sub-standard performance or imminent mechanical failure.

Eastvold et al. disclose an apparatus for communicating with, monitoring, and gathering data from a plurality of programmable test devices connected to predetermined points on a network of equipment.

*Contact Information*

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carol S. W. Tsai whose telephone number is (571) 272-2224. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marc S. Hoff can be reached on (571) 272-2216. The fax number for TC 2800 is (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2800 receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1585 or (571) 272-2800.

In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, Group 2800 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office actions directly into the Group at (703) 872-9306. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into Group 2800 will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.



Carol S. W. Tsai  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2857

01/26/05